

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 17 and 25-27 to incorporate the subject matter of claims 19, 35, 37, and 39, respectively. Applicants have also cancelled claims 19, 35, 37, and 39, without prejudice or disclaimer. In addition, Applicants have amended claim 17 to correct a minute typographic mistake.

In the Final Office Action dated April 7, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 17-19, 25-27, and 34-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) were rejected as being anticipated by Call (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,210).

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Each of independent claims 17 and 25-27, as amended, recites, among other things, “the alternative functionality includes displaying identifying information unique to each of the supplier and the reseller, the first set of information including identifying information unique to the supplier and the second set of information including identifying information unique to the reseller.”

Call does not teach or suggest the above recited claim limitations. Call is directed to a system for enabling retrieval of information about products from the source of the products (the manufacturer) by resellers and consumers. (2:32-37). The system uses a product code translator that stores cross-references between product codes and Internet addresses. (2:48-50). The product code translator includes a registration handler that accepts cross-references submitted by manufacturers which relate their assigned universal product codes to associated Internet addresses where information relating to their products can be obtained (3:48-52). The product code translator also includes a query handler that accepts queries via the Internet, where each query

includes all or part of a universal product code, and it returns the Internet addresses which can be used to obtain information about the products identified by the codes. (3:53-58).

In the Call system “[w]hen an incoming query is received by the query handler . . . a table lookup function is performed by searching [a] cross-reference table. . . for a row record . . . which specif[ies] a set of universal product codes which include the code or codes specified by the query. If matching rows(s) are found, **the IP-address(es) found in the matching rows(s) are returned to the query submitter.**” (6:53-59). Call merely returns IP addresses of the matching codes submitted in the query. The IP addresses relate to the “URL which specifies the Internet resource which will make that product information available.” (6:40-42). The product code translator performs “a translation of specified universal products codes into the corresponding Internet addresses from which information about the designated products can be obtained.” (2:44-47). Call does not mention or otherwise disclose any “information unique to each of the supplier and the reseller,” much less “alternative functionality [that] includes displaying identifying information unique to each of the supplier and the reseller, the first set of information including identifying information unique to the supplier and the second set of information including identifying information unique to the reseller,” as recited in claims 17 and 25-27.

Since the Office Action does not provide any explanation of why former claims 19, 35, 37, and 39 were rejected based on Call, Applicants do not understand the basis for the rejection of the subject matter now recited in independent claims 17 and 25-27.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection, Applicants request the Examiner to point out the portions of Call that allegedly disclose any claim limitations.

For at least these reasons, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants submit that dependent claims 18, 34, 36, and 38 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of Call at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims 17, and 25-27, respectively.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the claim rejections, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 7, 2006

By: Leila R. Abdi Reg. No. 53,232
for Reg. No. 52,399